

## **REMARKS**

This Amendment is fully responsive to the non-final Office Action dated December 7, 2007, issued in connection with the above-identified application. Claims 1-15 were all the claims pending in the application. With this Amendment, claims 1 and 7-15 have been amended; and claims 2-6 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer to the subject matter therein. No new matter has been added by the amendments made to the claims. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

The Applicants have provided herein a replacement abstract to correct minor informalities. A marked-up copy of the abstract is provided on a separate sheet.

In the Office Action, claims 1-15 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Suzuki (European Patent No. 1413979, hereafter “Suzuki”) in view of Hasegawa (U.S. Publication No. 2004/0072592, hereafter “Hasegawa”).

Claims 2-6 have been canceled rendering the above rejection to those claims moot.

Additionally, the Applicants have amended independent claims 1 and 13-15 to further distinguish the present invention over the cited prior art. For example, claim 1, in relevant part, recites the following features:

“A wireless communications terminal capable of performing a contactless communication and at least one wireless communication, comprising: ...

a wireless communications control section operable to (i) analyze, in response to an initiation of a contactless communication performed by said second wireless communications section, a command received by said second wireless communications section, (ii) deactivate said first wireless communications section when the command received is requesting access to a tamper resistant memory (TRM) area or a secure flash memory in a memory management area, and (iii) temporarily deactivate said first wireless communications section when the command received is requesting access to a general area in the memory management area.”

The features noted above in claim 1 are similarly recited in independent claims 13-15. Specifically, claim 13 is directed to a corresponding method, claim 14 is directed to a corresponding switching program; and claim 15 is directed to an integrated circuit; all of which

include the features of the wireless communications control section of claim 1. The features noted above are fully supported by the Applicants' disclosure (see e.g., pg. 14, line 22-pg. 16, line 2).

The present invention, as recited in claims 1 and 13-15, is directed to features of a wireless communications control section implemented in, for example, a communications terminal. The wireless communications control section prevents radio interference with contactless communications caused by wireless communications via a communications network. The control section prevents the interference by deactivating wireless communications during the contactless communications. Additionally, the deactivation or restriction of the wireless communications via a communications network can be applied differently depending on the security level of the memory management area being accessed in the communications terminal.

The Applicants maintain that at least the following features performed by the wireless communications control section of claims 1 and 13-15 are distinguishable over the cited prior art:

- 1) analyzing, in response to an initiation of a contactless communications performed by a second wireless communications section, a command received by the second wireless communications section;
- 2) deactivating a wireless communications function of the first wireless communications section when the received command is requesting access to a TRM area or a secure flash memory in a memory management area; and
- 3) temporarily deactivating the wireless communications function of the first wireless communications section when the received command is requesting access to a general area in the memory management area.

In the Office Action, the Examiner relied on Suzuki in view of Hasegawa for disclosing or suggesting all the features of independent claims 1 and 13-15. Specifically, the Examiner relied on Suzuki for disclosing all the features of independent claims 1 and 13-15 except for a wireless communication control section operable to restrict wireless communications based on a status of a contactless communication by a first wireless communications section. However, the Examiner relied on Hasegawa for disclosing or suggesting this feature.

The Applicants maintain that Suzuki in view of Hasegawa clearly fails to disclose or suggest all the features of claims 1 and 13-15 (as amended).

Specifically, Suzuki discloses a terminal capable of achieving more favorable reception sensitivity during contactless communications even in a case where several wireless communication functions are being used simultaneously. However, in Suzuki, only contactless communications appear to be restricted. In other words, Suzuki does not describe a restriction of wireless communications via a network when contactless communications are being performed. The Examiner also noted this deficiency in Suzuki in the Office Action (see e.g., pg. 3).

Moreover, based on the deficiency noted above in Suzuki, it logically follows that the reference also fails to disclose or suggests that the terminal restricts wireless communications differently depending on the memory areas being accessing in the terminal. Finally, nowhere in Suzuki does it disclose the use of a memory management area divided into a TRM area, a secure flash memory area, and a general memory area.

Therefore, the features noted above in claims 1 and 13-15 are clearly distinguished over Suzuki.

After a detailed review of Hasegawa, the reference fails to overcome all the deficiencies noted above in Suzuki. Hasegawa discloses a wireless communication terminal capable of performing contactless communications and other wireless communications. Although Hasegawa discloses restricting functions of a wireless terminal, the restrictions implemented appear to be quite different from that of the present invention (i.e., claims 1 and 13-15).

Specifically, in Hasegawa, when an area is entered where contactless communications is possible, the wireless communication terminal is placed in a “restricted place mode” so that settings can be collectively managed to thereby define the restricted area (see e.g., ¶ 0036-¶ 0040). For example, “a radio wave off mode” or “a vibration mode” can be used to define the restricted area where contactless communications are performed.

Hasegawa fails, however, to disclose or suggests at least that the wireless communication terminal restricts wireless communications via a communications network differently depending of the memory areas being accessing in the wireless communication terminal. Additionally,


(similar to Suzuki) Hasegawa fails to disclose or suggest the use of a memory management area divided into a TRM area, a secure flash memory area, and a general memory area. Therefore, the features noted above in claims 1 and 13-15 are also clearly distinguished over Suzuki.

Based on the above discussion, independent claims 1 and 13-15 are not unpatentable, or otherwise rendered obvious, by Suzuki in view of Hasegawa. Similarly, claims 7-12 are not unpatentable, or otherwise rendered obvious, by Suzuki in view of Hasegawa based at least on their dependency from independent claim 1.

Based on the foregoing, the Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejections presented in the Office Action dated December 7, 2007, and pass this application to issue. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney by telephone to resolve any remaining issues.

Respectfully submitted,

Yuka MATSUSHITA et al.

By:   
Mark D. Pratt  
Registration No. 45794  
Attorney for Applicants

MDP(DMO)/ats  
Washington, D.C. 20006-1021  
Telephone (202) 721-8200  
Facsimile (202) 721-8250  
March 7, 2008